

REMARKS

Claims 1-28 are pending in the application. In the Final Office Action of August 28, 2003, the Examiner made the following disposition:

- A.) Objected to claims 1 and 2 for informalities.
- B.) Rejected claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 11-15, 17, 18, 24 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by *Dulude et al.*
- C.) Rejected claims 3, 16, 25, 26 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Dulude et al.* in view of *Epstein*.
- D.) Rejected claims 6-10 and 19-23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Dulude et al.* in view of *Ohtsuki et al.*

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections and addresses the Examiner's disposition as follows:

A.) Objection to claims 1 and 2 for informalities:

Claims 1-7, 9-10, 13-20, 22-23 and 25-28 have been amended as per the Examiner's request to overcome the objection.

Applicant respectfully submits the objection has been overcome and requests that it be withdrawn.

B.) Rejection of claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 11-15, 17, 18, 24 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by *Dulude et al.*:

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the rejection.

Applicant's independent claim 1, 14 and 28, each as amended, each claim a person authentication authority that receives a request for updating an issued electronic person authentication certificate from an entity that received the electronic person authentication certificate, makes a second electronic person authentication certificate in which an updated certificate expiration date or an updated certificate usage number limit is set according to the request, and then issues the second electronic person authentication certificate.

This is clearly unlike *Dulude*, which fails to disclose or even suggest issuing a second certificate having an updated certificate expiration date or updated certificate usage number responsive to a request from an entity that received a certificate. *Dulude* discloses issuing a certificate that includes a set of data 10, which includes a validity period to determine an expiration of validity of the certificate. After the certificate is received, it can be used until the

expiration of the validity period.

Unlike Applicant's claims 1, 14 and 28, nowhere does *Dulude* disclose or even suggest issuing a second certificate having an updated certificate expiration date or updated certificate usage number responsive to a request from an entity that received a certificate. In fact, *Dulude* fails to even discuss issuing a second certificate responsive to a request, or updating its validity period.

Therefore, *Dulude* fails to disclose or even suggest claims 1, 14 and 28.

Claims 2, 4, 5, 11-15, 17, 18, 24 depend directly or indirectly from claims 1 or 14 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons that claims 1 and 14 are allowable.

Applicant respectfully submits the rejection has been overcome and requests that it be withdrawn.

C.) Rejection of claims 3, 16, 25, 26 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Dulude et al.* in view of *Epstein*:

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the rejection.

As described above, Applicant's independent claims 1 and 14, each as amended, each claim a person authentication authority that receives a request for updating an issued electronic person authentication certificate from an entity that received the electronic person authentication certificate, makes a second electronic person authentication certificate in which an updated certificate expiration date or an updated certificate usage number limit is set according to the request, and then issues the second electronic person authentication certificate.

Independent claims 25, 26 and 27, each as amended, also claim that subject matter described above with respect to claims 1 and 14.

Thus, claims 25, 26 and 27 are allowable over *Dulude* for at least the same reasons that claims 1 and 14 are allowable over *Dulude*. Specifically, *Dulude* fails to disclose or suggest issuing a second certificate having an updated certificate expiration date or updated certificate usage number responsive to a request from an entity that received a certificate.

Further, claims 1, 14, 25, 26 and 27 are allowable over *Dulude* in view of *Epstein*. *Epstein* discloses a ticket that identifies a usage limit associated with each copy of a copy-protected material. If there are multiple copies of the same material, then a provider of the copies maintains a total-usage-measure for all the copies that have been "checked out" by patrons. When a checked-out copy is returned, then the total-usage measure indicates that another copy is available for check-out.

Thus, unlike Applicant's independent claims, *Epstein* does not teach issuing a second certificate having an updated certificate usage number responsive to a request from a recipient of a certificate. Instead, *Epstein* merely issues a ticket that is good for a number of uses, and does not issue a second ticket. In fact, *Dulude* fails to even discuss issuing a second ticket responsive to a request.

Therefore, *Dulude* in view of *Epstein* fails to disclose or even suggest claims 1, 14, 25, 26 and 27.

Claims 3 and 16 depend directly or indirectly from claims 1 or 14 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons that claims 1 and 14 are allowable.

Applicant respectfully submits the rejection has been overcome and requests that it be withdrawn.

D.) Rejection of claims 6-10 and 19-23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Dulude et al.* in view of *Ohtsuki et al.*:

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the rejection.

Claims 1 and 14 are allowable over *Dulude* as discussed above. *Dulude* in view of *Ohtsuki* still fails to disclose or suggest claims 1 and 14. *Ohtsuki* discloses reading an expiration date from a ticket and compares it to the present date. If the comparison reveals that the ticket has expired, then the ticket's user is made aware that the ticket has expired. (Col. 6, lines 9-22).

Unlike Applicant's claims 1 and 14, nowhere does *Ohtsuki* even discuss issuing a second certificate having an updated certificate usage number responsive to a request from a recipient of a certificate. Instead, *Ohtsuki* merely checks to determine whether a ticket has expired, and does not issue a second ticket.

The Examiner argues that "[i]t is suggested that the expiration data can be modified according to the user's preset data (col. 6, ll 53-57)." (Office Action of 8/28/03, page 9). However, that passage from *Ohtsuki* does not describe what the Examiner argues that it describes. That passage from *Ohtsuki* merely states that the expiration date on the ticket can be compared to a predetermined time period, instead of comparing the expiration date to the present date. Thus, that passage from *Ohtsuki* fails to relate to modifying expiration data.

Therefore, *Dulude* in view of *Ohtsuki* fails to disclose or even suggest claims 1 and 14.

Claims 6-7, 9-10, 19-20 and 22-23 depend directly or indirectly from claims 1 or 14 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons that claims 1 and 14 are allowable.

Claims 8 and 21 have been canceled.

Applicant respectfully submits the rejection has been overcome and requests that it be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that claims 1-28 are patentable. It is therefore submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Christopher P. Rauch (Reg. No. 45,034)

Christopher P. Rauch

SONNENSCHNEIDER, NATH & ROSENTHAL

P.O. Box #061080

Wacker Drive Station - Sears Tower

Chicago, IL 60606-1080

Telephone 312/876-2606

Customer #26263

Attorneys for Applicant(s)

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 on January 28, 2004.

Christopher P. Rauch (Reg. No. 45,034)
Christopher P. Rauch